

1067. Question.

1043. Are we permitted to submit the Exceeding the Minimum / Desirable Features Matrix Exhibit form electronically (CD) and not copy the form into the proposal?

**Answer: Offerors are only required to submit this exhibit electronically on CD.**

**This answer conflicts with the RFP Instructions which say:**

**Exceeding the Minimum and Desirable Features / Instructions**

The offeror shall fill in the appropriate group-specific Exceeding the Minimum / Desirable Features Matrix Exhibit (Exhibits EMDFA through EMDFD) and submit it under TAB 4 in the Management/Technical Approach proposal.

This section shall identify elements of the proposed system that exceed the Minimum Mandatory Specifications (in TAB 1) in sufficient detail for the Government to understand how the proposed features exceed the Government minimum specifications. The offeror shall fill in the appropriate Exhibit to describe these elements and shall only address the Exceeding the Minimum criteria specified within the class-specific exhibit.

This section shall indicate all items identified in the Technical Specifications as Desirable Features that the offeror chooses to provide. The offeror shall fill in the appropriate Exhibit to either indicate if the proposed system meets the Desirable Feature (if a Yes/No response is required) or describe the salient characteristics in sufficient detail for the Government to determine whether the proposed features correspond to the Government-identified desirable features (if a Description is required). The offeror shall only address the Desirable Features specified within the group-specific exhibit.

**This Exhibit shall count in the page total.**

Please clarify if EMDF is to be printed (or not).

**Answer: The EMDF exhibits have been reformatted to set the print area and to print in landscape format. The previous response indicating that TAB4 can be submitted only electronically is no longer valid – the instructions in the RFP remain as stated and TAB 4 must be submitted as a printout and is part of the page count. The printout must use the formatting as provided. If any changes to the format are done, the Government will re-print in the original format to perform the page count.**

1068. A.3.6. PROPOSAL PREPARATION-GENERAL INSTRUCTION When printing out Tab 4 (Exceeding the Minimum/Desirable Features), are we permitted to print the Excel spreadsheet in "landscape" format to ensure all 3 columns of information can be printed on a single page and provide ease for evaluation? Using the currently set "portrait" format would prove problematic for evaluation as each column would be a separate page and look disjointed. Using landscape would also make the print out for this Tab around a total of 2 pages.

**Answer: See response to Question 1067.**

1069. 4.8. Storage Specialists Please explain how the available components tab in the PEC calculates all proposed available components costs as the pricing for them appears to be limited to certain formula. For example the \$ amount for the available components we are proposing in our computer systems tab does not appear accurately in the summary tab. In the sample .xls under maint.warranty tab there are two items totaling \$10K and it shows up in the summary tab as \$3M with 0 disc. If this is the way it should be please let us know.

**Answer: See response to Question 1065 in Q&A Set #5.**

1070. I. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-4) (JUL 2013)

In section 4.1 Single Storage Devices - Blu-ray player, in searching through industry, there are Blu-ray players that meet the spec, but they are NOT TAA compliant. Will NASA consider removing this?

4.1. Single Storage Devices The following devices must be provided: a. Blu-ray Disc Player 1. Built-in WiFi 2. Built-in 3d 3. HDMI 4. 1080i Output 5. Remote 6. External hard disk drive - 40GB storage (desirable) 7. Game Console (desirable) 8. Streaming services including annual subscriptions (desirable)

**Answer: The Blu-ray player has been changed to a desirable.**

1071. 4.2.1. Storage Devices Core Specification In reference to requirement 4.2.2.c. Large Robotic Device, the specifications are clearly written for the Oracle Modular Library System, even after the revision to remove the STK drives. While obviously a technologically advanced device, the requirements for the number of drives, capacity, audit time, average cell to drive time, and expandability cannot be met by other leading manufacturers, including Hewlett-Packard, IBM, and Spectralogic. Oracle is limiting authorization to only a few of their select reseller partners, which means that a vast majority of HUBZone resellers will not be able to submit a proposal because they cannot provide a compliant solution to this minimum mandatory requirement due to Oracle's restrictions. The government should retain control of decision making and not allow Oracle to dominate the rights to this 10-year contract, which will only result in limited competition due to Oracle's monopoly despite the likelihood that other OEMs will produce a competitive device within the next ten years. Please revise the specifications to either remove the OEM authorization for the device or alter the specifications to accommodate those of the other OEM devices.

**Answer: The requirement for the robotic device to be from an authorized reseller has been changed to desirable.**

1072. If we submit our SEWP proposals on November 27<sup>th</sup> (the day before Thanksgiving) and an amendment comes out before December 3<sup>rd</sup> may we resubmit our proposals?

**Answer: Yes, Offerors can resubmit proposals prior to the proposal due date; however, Offerors must withdraw any earlier submission(s) to avoid being disqualified.**

1073. Can the Government please confirm that the **Attention** line for **A.3.16.2 External Marking and Delivery** has been changed back to Natesa Robinson?

**Answer: The Contracting Officer for External Marking and Delivery is LaShawn Davis. Amendment 7 has an administrative error at section A.3.16.2. Correction will be made in Amendment 8.**

1074. Amendment 6 to Amendment 7 changes, please clarify:

A.3.1, A.3.4: Changes POC from LaShawn Davis back to Natesa Robinson

A.3.6(b)(1): Removes Tab 3 from list of items excluded from page limitations. Adds Small Business Subcontracting Plan History back to list. Adds List of Acronyms back to list.

A.3.7(2): Removes note indicating that 508 documentation can be provided electronically on CD-ROM.

A.3.8: Includes reference to the model contract that were removed in Amendment 6. Restores the requirement to include RFP Parts I and II as part of the Model Contract. Removes language to include signed original SF30 of all amendments. Removes the requirement for an Acronyms list that was added as part of Amendment 6.

A.3.12.1: Removes the requirement to submit EMDFA through EMDFD in Excel format.

A.3.13: Restores requirements for including a Tab 1 as part of the Past Performance Volume.

A.3.16: Changes POC from LaShawn Davis back to Natesa Robinson

A.4.6: Restores language removed in Amendment 6 which includes cost realism in the evaluation of the Technical/Management approach.

**Answer: Amendment 7 had reverted to old information (an administrative error) in these sections.**

**Correction will be made in Amendment 8.**

1075. Amendment 7, Q&A #5, Question #1054. The Government's response to Question 1054 is that Tab 4 exhibits, which are included in the 90-page limit, are only required to be submitted electronically. This is a new requirement not reflected in the conformed RFP and impacts the 90-page limit of Volume II.

Please remove Tab 4 from the 90 page limit requirement for Volume II in the conformed RFP and please amend the response to allow for electronic submittal of Exhibits only (MMX and EMDFX).

**Answer: See answer to Question 1067.**

1076. Conformed RFP issued with Amendment 7 It appears that changes made in the Government's Amendment 6 conformed RFP are not reflected in the Government's Amendment 7 conformed RFP.

For example,

- In Section A.3.6, the requirement to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan History as part of Volume IV was removed with Amendment 6's RFP. This requirement has reappeared in Amendment 7's RFP.
- In section A.3.7, the note that 508 documentation may be provided electronically was added with Amendment 6's RFP and is missing from Amendment 7's RFP.
- In section A.3.8 of the Instructions, the requirement to return the model contract as part of Volume I was removed in Amendment 6's RFP and reappears in Amendment 7's RFP.
- In section A.3.13, the statement "This shall be Tab 1 of the Past Performance Volume" was removed with Amendment 6's RFP and reappears in Amendment 7's RFP.

Will the Government advise if the conformed RFP issued with Amendment 7 is correct?

**Answer: Amendment 8 will correct this administrative error.**

1077. After reviewing the RFP provided with Amendment 007 on 11/7/13, parts of this RFP do not contain all the changes from previous Amendments such as but not limited to A.3.4 POC, A.3.6 Tab 3 is missing from "excluded in page count" on the table but cites it in the text, Past Performance Volume has the Acronym list and SB history, A.3.7 508 Documentation, A.3.8 Model Contract, etc. specifically from Amendment 006. We believe that this is probably an error; however the Offeror must follow the **current** RFP instructions to be compliant and not the answers to the questions. If this RFP provided with

Amendment 007 stands and it puts back in the requirements deleted or modified from previous Amendments this will add significant burden to industry in order to submit a compliant proposal on December 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**Question:** Would the Government please review the RFP provided with Amendment 007, update with the all the changes from Amendments 001 thru 007 due to Q&A's, highlight changes, and repost to ensure that we provide the Government with a compliant proposal submission?

**Answer: Yes. See the conformed RFP Amendment 8.**

1078. Per Q&A 1062 requiring that the TAA certificate table be completed with proposal submission for Tab 3 Available Components this TAA certificate table could be a significant number of pages depending on how many products you are proposing.

**Question:** Would the Government consider (1) Submission of the TAA Certificate table as an excel spreadsheet in electronic form only instead of paper copy and include it as part of Volume I – Offer Volume at no page count limit.

**TAA is handled at the delivery order level but is applicable to all items offered on the SEWP contracts since the estimated dollar value of each contract exceeds the established Trade Agreements Act. As previously noted, information concerning TAA compliance for available components will be handled post-award at the time the products are added to the SEWP catalog. Therefore, at the time of the proposal, only the mandatory items need to have the TAA documentation in the proposal.**

1079. There seems to be an issue with the latest version of the conformed RFP released with Amendment 7. Much of the RFP text, specifically within the section for the instructions and technical specifications, has reverted back to the pre-conformed RFP prior to Amendment 6. Will NASA please release a new conformed version?

**Answer: Amendment 8 is an administrative correction to include a new conformed RFP version, which highlights all revisions from Amendment 1 through 7.**

1080. we wanted to make you aware, if you weren't already, of some problems with the latest conformed RFP issued under Mod 7. When we did a compare, we detected that some of the fixes that were carried in the prior version issued under Amendment 6 have been reversed. While I can't say for sure, the problem seems to start with the instructions around page 125.

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1081. The questions were addressed in this last set of Q/As (#5), but the conformed RFP didn't include the updates to the SOW, MA and EMDFA tables which need to be made. I would ask that you review our question #39 from today where we request those updates to the RFP. These updates may have been missed when you issued Amendment 7.

**Answer: Amendment 8 updates the SOW, MMA and EMDFA.**

1082. In Q&A set 5, Questions 1043 and 1054 state that the EMDF files are only required to be submitted electronically. Does this mean that the files are now excluded from page count? If not, how will the Government count the pages? Should we format the pages as we would have if we were to print them?

**Answer: See answer to Question 1067.**

1083. A.1.47. TRADE AGREEMENTS CERTIFICATE 52.225-6 (JAN 2005) At proposal submission time, does the offeror need to complete A.1.47. TRADE AGREEMENTS CERTIFICATE 52.225-6 listing every Non-TAA compliant product included in the available components list and submit this with the proposal.

**Answer: No - for available components, TAA compliance flagging and documentation will be handled after contract award when the items are uploaded to the SEWP database of record.**

1084. A.3.7. PROPOSAL VOLUMES Is any type of narrative response expected or required by Section A.3.8. to address FAR 9.104, or can the offeror simply provide a statement that the offeror will comply with FAR 9.104 upon contract award.

**Answer: See the instructions of the Solicitation Section A.3.8 Information concerning Responsibility: All Offeror's shall provide information addressing all of the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility.**

1085. 3.2. Group A: Computer System Class Specific Specifications In Q&A#5 the government answered five (5) questions (#982, #983, #984, #997 and #1002) to clarify that the Class 1A (Mid-Range Cluster) Computer System has a processor requirement that each of the 36 nodes have two "Sandy Bridge" sockets/processors, 8 core each with a 2.3GHz clock rate (mandatory) and 2.5GHz clock rate(desirable.) Will the government please update the SOW, MMA and EMDFA tables released with Amendment 7 to reflect these (2.3 GHz and 2.5 GHz) values in section 3.2.1.1. d. and 3.2.1.1. e. and eliminate the confusion caused by the conflict between the answers to these five questions and the latest versions of the SOW, MMA and EMDFA?

**Answer: This has been updated in Amendment 8. The information in the exhibits is not the specifications, but just a reference back to the RFP. If a conflict exists, the specifications in the RFP are controlling:**

**"Short descriptions for ease of filling in the table. The Vendor Response should reflect the vendor's ability to meet the full requirements as stated in the referenced technical section. If there are any discrepancies between the text in the table and the referenced technical section, then the information in the referenced technical section in the RFP takes precedence"**

1086. A.3.7. PROPOSAL VOLUMES The conformed RFP Released on 10-24-13 with Amend 06 included the following instructions for the Offer Volume, which was highlighted as a change: "The offeror shall sign four original SF 1449s and return with your offer. The offeror shall sign one original SF30 of all amendments issued. Parts I and II become the Model Contract after award." The conformed RFP Released on 11-7-13 with Amend 07 reverts back to prior (pre-Amend 06) language regarding the Model Contract, below, however this section was not indicated as a changed paragraph in the Amend 07 cover letter: "Model Contract ? The offeror shall sign four original SF 1449s and return with your offer the model contract (SF 1449, and Parts I and II of this RFP)." Please confirm that the Govt intended to change this instruction and whether the Model Contract is now required with Volume I proposal submission.

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1087. I. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-4) (JUL 2013)  
It appears the Conformed RFP released November 7th with Amendment 7 has removed some elements that were changed in the conformed RFP released October 23rd with Amendment 6 that do not follow the answers to questions. For example: - Section A.3.1 and Section A.3.4. LaShawn Davis has been replaced with Natesa R. Robinson. The text ?Mail Stop: 210? has also been removed. The conformed RFP

released October 23 updated the Name and Address of the Contracting Officer. - Section A.3.6.b.1, table of proposal components. Tab 3 has been removed from excluded pages under the Management Volume. A small business subcontracting plan history and a list of acronyms has been added back into the Past Performance Volume. The conformed RFP released October 23 added Tab 3 to the excluded page limitations. Additionally, it removed the small business subcontracting plan history and list of acronyms from the Past Performance Volume. - Section A.3.7.2. The text "Please Note: 508 Documentation may be provided electronically, on CD ROM." has been removed. The conformed RFP released October 23 added that text to the RFP. - Section A.3.8. The Model Contract and Parts I and II of the RFP have been added to the Offer Volume. Additionally, the SF30 and List of Acronyms requirements have been removed. The conformed RFP released October 23 removed the Model Contract requirements with Parts I and II of the RFP from the Offeror Volume and added the requirement to sign one original SF30 of all amendments issued to the Volume. It also added the text "The offeror shall submit the list of Acronyms, which applies to the entire proposal submission" to the RFP. - Section A.3.12.1, Exceeding the Minimum and Desirable Features / Instructions. The text "and shall be submitted in Excel format" has been removed. The conformed RFP released October 23 added that statement to the RFP. - Section A.3.13. The text "This shall be Tab 1 of the Past Performance Volume" has been added into the RFP. The conformed RFP released October 23 added that statement to the RFP. - A.3.14.1. The text "NASA Acquisition Internet System (NAIS) and the" has been added. The conformed RFP released October 23 removed that statement from the RFP. - A.3.16.2. External Marking and Delivery. LaShawn Davis has been replaced with Natesa Robinson. The conformed RFP released October 23 replaced Natesa Robinson with LaShawn Davis. - A.4.6. The text "The Management/Technical Approach evaluation will include the results of any cost realism analysis. The realism of proposed costs may significantly affect the offeror's Management/Technical Approach score." Has been added to the RFP. The conformed RFP released October 23 removed that statement from the RFP. Can you please advise the changes incorporated in Amendment 6 should be incorporated into the conformed copy of Amendment 7?

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1088. D.7. Order modifications It appears that changes made in the Government's Amendment 6 conformed RFP are not reflected in the Government's Amendment 7 conformed RFP. For example, "In Section A.3.6, the requirement to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan History as part of Volume IV was removed with Amendment 6's RFP. This requirement has reappeared in Amendment 7's RFP." In section A.3.7, the note that 508 documentation may be provided electronically was added with Amendment 6's RFP and is missing from Amendment 7's RFP. "In section A.3.8 of the Instructions, the requirement to return the model contract as part of Volume I was removed in Amendment 6's RFP and reappears in Amendment 7's RFP." In section A.3.13, the statement "This shall be Tab 1 of the Past Performance Volume" was removed with Amendment 6's RFP and reappears in Amendment 7's RFP. Will the Government advise if the conformed RFP issued with Amendment 7 is correct?

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1089. D.7. Order modifications The Government's response to Question 1054 is that Tab 4 exhibits, which are included in the 90-page limit, are only required to be submitted electronically. This is a new requirement not reflected in the conformed RFP and impacts the 90-page limit of Volume II. Please remove Tab 4 from the 90 page limit requirement for Volume II in the conformed RFP and please amend the response to allow for electronic submittal of Exhibits only (MMX and EMDFX).

**Answer: See response to Question 1067.**

1090. I. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-4) (JUL 2013)  
The new MMD and EMDFD MS Excel documents are in "Portrait" and not "Landscape" for

orientation. Can vendors change the document to Landscape and decrease the size to fit the data into a single page width? Otherwise the "Portrait" document will have single column data and multiple sheets for review of a single item. It will also cause an increase in page count for the EMDFD and separation of the column data for each entry.

**Answer: See response to question 1067.**

1091. III. INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS-COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-1) (JUL 2013)

There appear to be some problems with the latest conformed RFP issued under Mod 7. When we did a compare, we detected that some of the fixes that were carried in the prior version issued under Amendment 6 have been reversed. The inconsistencies seem to start with the instructions around page 125. Some examples are in A.3.1, A.3.4 and A.3.6

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1092. How many SF30's are required in Volume I? Amendment 6 RFP stated "The offeror shall sign one original SF30 of all amendments issued." Does this mean Qty 1 of each Amendment 1-7, even though the actual SF30's state other instructions? (ie. Per the SF30's: Amendments 1 and 2 are not required to be signed and returned, and Amendment 3 is required to be signed, with 4 copies returned.)

**Answer: The Offeror shall sign one original SF30 of all amendments issued. The Government has issued eight amendments under the SEWP V RFP. All signed documents are included in Volume I.**

1093. I. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-4) (JUL 2013)

The following changes from Questions and Answers Set 5 do appear to be in the revised RFP Amendment 7: Answer to Question 982-984 "The requirement will remain as stated in Amendment 6. Note that a processor of 2.3 Hz or greater will meet the minimum mandatory and a processor of 2.5Hz or greater will meet the desirable feature." conflicts with itself, as Amendment 6 changed the specs to 2.4Hz and 2.6Hz respectively and remains as stated, it is unclear how 2.3Hz and 2.5Hz would satisfy the requirement. Related 997 & 1002 - 2.3Hz is not in Amendment 7, it still has 2.4Hz, as stated above 989 - Amendment 6 removed the requirement of "Small Business Subcontracting Plan History", not Amendment 4, but it was put back in to Amendment 7 994, 998, 1003, 1015 1018 - it may be clearer if the RFP was updated to reflect raw capacity where applicable as done in 3.2.3.1.1 1043 - RFP still requires that the Exceeding the Minimum / Desirables exhibit in Tab 4 shall count in the page total , implying it should be printed. The following requirements in RFP Amendment 7 seem to have reverted to requirements from previous Amendments without explanation: A.4.6. MANAGEMENT/TECHNICAL APPROACH EVALUATION FACTORS "The Management/Technical Approach evaluation will include the results of any cost realism analysis. The realism of proposed costs may significantly affect the offeror's Management/Technical Approach score." has been re-inserted A.3.16.2. External Marking and Delivery CO information A.3.14.1. Electronic Availability of Pricing Exhibits "the NASA Acquisition Internet System (NAIS) and" is re-inserted A.3.13. PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME "This shall be Tab 1 of the Past Performance Volume." is re-inserted Exceeding the Minimum and Desirable Features / Instructions "and shall be submitted in Excel format." has been removed. A.3.8. INSTRUCTIONS FOR OFFER VOLUME INCLUDING EXECUTED STANDARD FORM 1449, AND REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS "The offeror shall submit the list of Acronyms, which applies to the entire proposal submission." has been removed. "The offeror shall sign four original SF 1449s and return with your offer. The offeror shall sign one original SF30 of all amendments issued. Parts I and II become the Model Contract after award." has been removed and replaced with "Model Contract ? The offeror shall sign four original SF 1449s and return with your offer the model contract (SF 1449, and Parts I and II of this RFP)." A.3.7. PROPOSAL VOLUMES "Please Note: 508 Documentation may be provided electronically, on CD ROM." has been removed (b) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS "and Tab 3" is

missing "Small Business Subcontracting Plan History" is re-inserted A.3.4 SERVICE OF PROTEST (52.233 2) (SEP 2006) CO information A.3.1. COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING THIS SOLICITATION (GSFC 52.215-96) (AUG 2000) Group C (Server Support and Multi-Functional Devices) deliverable items "Ergonomic" is back in for mouse and keyboard 5.9.2. Medium Volume Color MFD Requirements "c. Full offset stacking capability (with no sorter bins required)" desirable has been removed 5.9.1. High Volume Monochrome MFD Requirements "c. Full offset stacking capability (with no sorter bins required)" desirable has been removed To ensure all offerors are working with the correct contractual and technical requirements, please provide a final conformed RFP that reflects the answers and guidance provided in Questions and Answers Sets 1 through 5.

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1094. A.3.7. PROPOSAL VOLUMES (Pages 129-130 | Part III. Instructions to Offerors - Commercial Items | Section A.3.8 Instructions for Offer Volume Including Executed Standard Form 1449 and Representations and Certifications) - Prior to Amendment 000006, the Model Contract (i.e., comprised of Standard Form 1449 and RFP Parts I and II) was required to be included in Volume I, Offer Volume. As part of Amendment 000006, the Model Contract was no longer required to be included in Volume I, Offer Volume. Now, after Amendment 000007, it appears that the Model Contract is again required to be included in Volume I, Offer Volume. Please clarify as to whether or not the Model Contract is required to be included in Volume I, Offer Volume.

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1095. In Reference to: Section 5.2.1 (a) "Adobe Postscript Level 3.0 formatted print files "

Question: "Adobe Postscript level 3.0" language is Adobe's proprietary language that is licensed by several printer manufacturers. Once licensed, printer manufacturers customize it to integrate it with their technologies. Once customized, they may change the name of this to call it their own. For example, HP comes with "HP postscript level 3 emulation". This vendor respectfully requests the government to change this spec to read "Postscript Level 3.0 or equal"

**Answer: The requirement will be revised to indicate that emulation/equivalent is acceptable in Amendment 8.**

1096. In the Category B, Group D, there is a specification for a "LAN Switch". Not a problem to source or price, however, NASA's Pricing Exhibit allow only one number to be entered for the LAN switch, not multiple line items for the specific additional part numbers associated with a LAN switch that meets the requirements as specified

In other words, it's not just one part # that'd have to be ordered to get a LAN Switch that meets the specifications. LAN Switches, as well as other items in the Category and Group are a compilation of several part numbers delineating specific capacity, features and functionality. A LAN switch can be configured in many different ways. Are we supposed to propose an amount that is the sum of all the OEM part #'s we'd need to order to provide a LAN Switch that satisfies the full LAN Switch spec, or are we only allowed to propose the price for the single base part number alone ?

**Answer: The line item price should be the total price of all component parts needed to meet the minimum mandatory specifications for that item.**

1097. For 4.5 UPS, Multiple manufacturers are claiming 508 exception. The following is an example of the statement.



"The policy of XXXX is to incorporate the highest levels of universal accessibility and usability into the design of all of the products it manufactures. XXXX supports federal accessibility legislation such as Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (found at 29 U.S.C. 794d); however, XXXX maintains that its products are exempt from Section 508, according to Section 1194.3 (General Exceptions): " . . . products located in spaces frequented only by service personnel for maintenance, repair, or occasional monitoring of equipment are not required to comply with this part."

Is a letter from the manufacturer stating this exemption sufficient for 508 compliance? If not, what is?

**Answer: Documentation, such as a letter, stating that a particular item is exempt and providing the specific reason for the exemption would be sufficient.**

1098. Question in reference to 4.6 508 compliance Is 508 documentation/VPAT required on a minimum mandatory item for services such as 4.6 on-site data destruction services?

**Answer: As stated in the RFP, 508 documentation is only required where applicable. 508 does not apply to labor services including on-site data destruction services, although it can apply to the results of such services (; e.g. software development).**

1099. As it relates to 508 documentation, if a manufacture provides a 508 statement that applies to specific product series, and not specific parts, is this suitable for valid 508 supporting documents, or is a VPAT or GPAT needed for submission?

**Answer: If the statement clearly and fully relates to 508 compliance for the product(s) being proposed, then that would be sufficient. However, the preferred methodology is to submit a VPAT or GPAT.**

1100. Does all 508 Documentation for Tab 1, have to be in the format of a GPAT or VPAT?

**Answer: No – if there is other documentation that clearly and fully relates to 508 compliance for the products being proposed, then that can be submitted. However, the preferred methodology is to submit a VPAT or GPAT.**

1101. In the RFP it states “other supporting documentation” can be provided, will a product spec sheet be a valid form of “other documentation”?

**Answer: No – a product spec sheet does not clearly or fully relate to 508 compliance. The documentation must provide clear and specific information concerning how the product meets the appropriate 508 compliance requirements.**

1102. I. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-4) (JUL 2013)  
When does the comment period close?

**Answer: November 15, 2013.**

1103. A.3.15 PRICING EXHIBITS The November 7th conformed copy of the RFP released with Amendment 7 appears as if it was revised from a conformed copy created earlier than the version released on October 23rd with Amendment 6. Several changes made to the RFP in Amendment 6 appear to have reverted to a version prior to Amendment 6. For example, the delivery instructions in Amendment 7 instruct bidders to deliver proposals to the attention of Natesa Robinson. In Amendment 6, this section was revised to LaShawn Davis. This is just one example of a change that was made in Amendment 6 which is now missing from the Amendment 7 version of the RFP.

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1104. There has been multiple questions on whether TAB 4 is a required page count section. On Q&A 5, question 1054 states, TAB 4 is only required to be submitted electronically (see below).

*1054. The SEWP V Tab 4 Excel spreadsheet (EMDFD Group D) will not print all pages. The cells are locked so you can not select the entire document to print. Should vendors just submit Tab 4 in landscape at 80% as an electronic submission? Otherwise there is no way to print the government required document to include as Tab 4.*

*Answer: The Exhibits are only required to be submitted electronically.*

The latest version of the RFP still states in section A.3.12.1 Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A), Exceeding the Minimum and Desirable Features / Instructions, (TAB 4)

Page 133, "This Exhibit shall count in the page total." Please clarify whether TAB 4 is only an electronic submission and/or whether it does or not count in the Management/Technical Page count.

**Answer: See response to Question 1067.**

1105. In Exhibit MMB, 4.2.2.d.1. Blade RAID array, it states "4.2.1.f. Scalable RAID: one or more listed OS's", while in Exhibit EMDFB, it lists the same reference number with a different requirement., "4.2.1.f. Scalable RAID: IBM GPFS file system ( desirable). Is the reference number correct?

**Answer: There was a typo and the requirement will be corrected to "4.2.1.g. Scalable RAID: one or more listed OS's" in Amendment 8.**

1106. The following changes made in Amendment 6 have not been included in the Amendment 7 RFP and do not appear to be addressed by any questions for Amendment 7. Please clarify.

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1107. Regarding 5.8. Point of Sale All in One System: May we provide multiple items (part numbers) to fulfill the requirement for the Point of Sale All in One System?

**Answer: Answer: Yes –minimum mandatory requirements can be met by a single item or a configured/bundled item.**

1108. Is it correct that there is ONE list of acronyms for the entire proposal included in Volume 1? And that acronym lists are NOT needed for any other volumes or parts of volumes (i.e. the tabs in Volume II)?

**Answer: See response to Questions 1079.**

1109. I. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-4) (JUL 2013)  
MMC 5.2.1.e. Color printer requirement of PCL5 and PCL6. QUESTION: Would the SEWP V office consider relaxing the PCL5/PCL6 requirement to just PCL5?

**Answer: The requirements will remain as stated.**

1110. 3.3. Product Based Services Support As noted in question 1058 and with respect to question 107, we have found that we can't rely on industry feedback to provide a valid TAA Blu-ray (4.1.(a)). We have even procured devices that we've been told by the OEMs that their item is compliant and it is determined, upon receipt, to be non-compliant. Again, we've been told by Disty, OEM's and the like that they have a compliant solution. I am respectfully asking if anyone on the team has been able to physically validate a compliant solution.

**Answer: The Blu-Ray requirement has been changed to a desirable feature.**

1111. 5.9. Multi-functional Device The answer to Q&A #968 regarding requirement 5.9.1.c (offset stacking) states "Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has been revised to make requirement a desirable feature." Amendment 6 did in fact make this requirement a desirable feature. Upon the release of Amendment 7, this requirement no longer states that it is a desirable feature. Based on this and other discrepancies between the conformed copies of the RFP released with Amendments 6 and 7, please confirm that this requirement is indeed a desirable feature. Please note that there are numerous instances within the Amendment 7 conformed copy of the RFP where changes made in Amendment 6 are now missing. It appears that the Amendment 7 conformed copy of the RFP may have been based on a version prior to the Amendment 6 conformed copy.

**Answer: See response to Question 1079.**

1112. V. OFFEROR REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS—COMMERCIAL ITEMS  
(52.212-3) (AUG 2013)--ALTERNATE I (APR 2011)

Offers proposals will include a large number of line items under Available Components and many of them will be listed by line item and country of origin per FAR 52.225-5 requirements. Accordingly, offerors Reps and Certs responses could be quite large in terms of the number of required pages to be compliant with the solicitation requirements. Would the government allow offerors to submit Reps and Certs responses in electronic format only to dramatically reduce the size of Volume I hard copies?

**Answer: Volume I does not have a page limitation.**

1113. If a VPAT is prepared is it ok to put N/A in all sections if the Item is not required to meet 508 compliance rules? If it is not ok to have a VPAT prepared with N/A in all sections if the Item is not required to meet 508 compliance rules, how do you suggest the partner provide the proper documentation for the minimum mandatory?

**Answer: As stated in the RFP, 508 documentation is only required where applicable. Therefore, if an item is not required to meet 508 compliance, then documentation is not required. However, it is recommended that a short statement as to why 508 is not applicable would be recommended.**

1114. 2. The MMD document that is required, for the sections 6.6.a.1 , 6.6.a.2, 6.6.b.1, and 6.6.b.2 states we need to provide a description, is the government expecting a job description for these roles?

**Answer: As indicated in the Notes section, a short description as to how the requirement is met should be provided. There is no requirement for a full job description.**

1115. 3. Does a VPAT filled out by the offer, partner or Third party need to be validated by the listed manufacturer?

**Answer: No.**

1116. 4. Does a VPAT need to be filled out for every individual product, or can a product series be referenced in a VPAT?

**Answer: The documentation must clearly state how the individual product meets the 508 compliance requirements. If the product series documentation clearly relates to the proposed product, then that would be sufficient.**

1117. 5. In the RFP it states, "The offeror shall describe whether the hardware and software proposed are the manufacturer's most recent offerings, i.e. current technology, and when in terms of time these

components fit in the manufacturer's line. The offeror shall document when the hardware and software were announced, the average product life-cycle for each (how often the offeror has released a new version of the software or replaced it), and how often new hardware has been announced." Does the government expect the offeror to provide this for each individual/unique part we bid as apart our of minimum mandatories it a chart form? Or can the offeror provide this confirmation throughout the narrative?

**Answer: There is no preferred method for responding to this section.**

1118. Do we need to have a price for all available components?

**Answer: Yes.**

1119. Reference: Reps and Certs (g)(5), Trade Agreements Certification and Question #259 and Question #1062. Relative to Available Components: Please clarify if you want the list of "Line Item No." and "County of Origin" completed and submitted with our proposal submission, or only entered after award by setting the "TAA flag" in the SEWP data base of record using the TR process? If your answer is at proposal submission, please clarify if this list can be submitted in the electronic copy, and hard copy is not required, since this list has the potential to be substantial depending on the individual vendor's solution?

**Answer: See response to Question 1078.**

1120. D.7. Order modifications After reviewing the 11/7/13 conforming RFP, we notice discrepancies from the last conforming RFP dated 10/23/13. I am siting some of the discrepancies (not all inclusive) mainly from Section A.3.6. Proposal Preparation - General Instructions as examples: Page # & Section Number referenced when first from 11/7/13 conforming RFP VERSUS 10/23/13 conforming RFP: 125 A.3.1; 126 A.3.4 and 142 A.3.16.2 VERSUS 130 A.3.1; 131 A.3.4 and 147 A.3.16.2 RESPECTIVELY Name changed from Natesa to LaShawn back to Natesa 128 A.3.6.(b)(1)(c) and 133 A.3.12.1 Tab 3 VERSUS 133 A.3.6.(b)(1)(c) and 138 A.3.12.1 Tab 3 RESPECTIVELY Is Tab 3 excluded from page limit still in Volume II? 128 A.3.6.(b)(1)(b) and 130 A.3.8 VERSUS 133 A.3.6.(b)(1)(b) and 135 A.3.8 RESPECTIVELY List of Acronyms - required? which volume? 129 A.3.7 and 131 A.3.11.1 VERSUS 134 A.3.7 and 136 A.3.11.1 RESPECTIVELY 508 documentation provided electronically? 129 A.3.8 VERSUS 134 A.3.8 RESPECTIVELY Model Contract - return parts I & II? 137 A.3.14.1 VERSUS 142 A.3.14.1 RESPECTIVELY NAIS no longer crossed out As we understand the conforming RFP requirements/instructions take precedence over the Q&A, we'd like to confirm if there will be a new conforming RFP released soon to address/correct these discrepancies.

**Answer: See response to Question 1079.**

1121. C.1.4. GENERAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS C.1.5.5.2 Quality of Parts, It is our standard commercial practices to provide a mixture of new and not new parts for repair services. All the parts are delivered from a parts system which mixes new and serviceable used parts so there is no way to identify when a not new part may be used. It is impossible to know at the quoting period or during the course of a repair under warranty or maintenance when a not new part may be used., However we are able to represent that they are in good working order and functionally equivalent. We believe there is no adverse affect to our customers when using not new/refurbished parts which are functionally equivalent and a requirement to identify them during the course of a repair offers no alternative to their use in any event . Could you please remove this statement "Any parts that are not new must be identified during the quoting period" from the requirement?

**Answer: No.**

1122. In Attachment D, Section D.2 would the government please provide further clarification of the difference between a "Delivery Order paid with a Government-issued credit card" and a "Credit Card Order"? Is it that Delivery Orders are issued by the SEWP Office and a Credit Card orders originate with the customer?

**Answer: “Delivery Order paid with a Government-issued credit card” refers to an official Government Delivery Order signed by a Contracting Officer and paid via a Government credit card. A “Credit Card Order” is an order placed by and paid by a Government Credit Card Holder.**

1123. In Attachment A, Section A.1.6, would the government please confirm that mandatory EPEAT and Energy Star compliance apply only to mandatory computers, laptops, monitors?

**Answer: Section A.1.6. is a definition section not a requirements section. The minimum mandatory requirements are listed in each subsequent requirement section (i.e. sections 3, 4, 5 and 6). For non-mandatory requirements, refer to A.1.19. TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT for procedures on requirements for adding all products including flagging of compliance levels.**

1124. In reference to CAT A Section 3.2.1.1 Sections D & E, in the latest Q&A there were 5 questions answered stating that for the 36 Node Cluster, Class 1: Mid-Range Cluster, will be compliant if the clusters have two "Sandy Bridge" sockets/processors, 8 core each with a 2.3GHz clock rate (mandatory) and 2.5GHz clock rate (desirable), however they did not change the RFP which takes precedence. Can NASA change the RFP to indicate that the 2.3GHz clock rate (mandatory) and 2.5GHz clock rate (desirable) are noted in this section?

**Answer: Section Revised in Amendment 8.**

1125. Amendment #6 Q&As requires bidders to bid a flat panel LCD monitor with the conference room double bay lectern and the LCD monitor can be no more than 18 inches in size. However, after doing an exhaustive search for LCD monitors that fit these specs, we are unable to find any that meet the spec and are TAA compliant at the same time. Is the Government willing to either relax the size spec, allowing for monitors up to 22", or relax the TAA Compliance spec specifically for this monitor for the lectern?

**Answer: The minimum is for the lectern to allow for up to 18 inches. A larger size can be proposed.**

1126. The Answer to questions 982, 983, and 984 states that 2.3 Ghz process will meet the minimum, while a 2.5 Ghz or greater will meet the desirable. Section 3.2.1.1 of the conformed RFP still requires a 2.4 GHz for the minimum and a 2.6 Ghz for the desirable. We request that the conformed RFP be updated to reflect the answer to the question.

**Answer: This section is revised in Amendment 8.**

1127. The answer to question 1049 instructs bidders to not bid a management switch as part of the required compute/storage systems for each container solution. The answer states that a separate line is provided for the switch requirement. In looking at the PEA.xls we only see a line for the Mid-Range Management Switch and the High-End Management Switch. We cannot find a line for the 3a or 3b container system. We request you clarify which on which lines these requirements should be bid in the PEA.xls.

**Answer: The Response to 1049 was based on the cluster solutions where a management switch is required and listed separately in the pricing exhibit. The container solutions are single line items in the pricing exhibit and therefore the price should be for the entire proposed container solution inclusive of all proposed items / costs.**

1128. The answer to Part IV: of question 1064 states that the PDU's for each configuration should only be bid on the line specified in the PEA.xls and in each of the cluster configurations. If the rack/PDU is supplied as part of an integrated solution (they are not separable from the rack solution) can the vendor only price the equipments as part of the line for each cluster configuration?

**Answer: Regardless of how the clusters are configured / priced, a separate price for the PDUs must be provided in Row 11 and 24 of the pricing exhibit.**